

FY2013 OHIO EPA PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM SUPERVISION PROGRAM
END-OF-YEAR SUMMARY
October 1, 2012, through September 30, 2013

Contacts:

- Ohio EPA Division of Drinking and Ground Waters (DDAGW) Assistant Chief – Beth Messer, beth.messer@epa.state.oh.us, (614) 644-2752
- U.S. EPA Region 5 Ohio State Program Manager – Wendy Drake, drake.wendy@epa.gov, (312) 886-6705

Federal funding used—PWSS grant; Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) wellhead protection (WHP), small systems technical assistance (SSTA), and PWSS set-asides; and Clean Water Act Section 106 funds (ground water)

FY 2013 end-of-year evaluation synopsis—Ohio EPA continues to meet requirements to maintain primacy of the drinking water program, and public water systems (PWSs) continue to maintain high compliance rates with drinking water regulations. Analysis of the various programs within Ohio’s drinking water program indicates that public health protection is the top priority. In FY2013, Ohio EPA exceeded its targets for the three national program measures related to community water systems (CWSs) meeting health-based standards ([SDW-2.1.1](#), [SDW-SP1.N11](#), and [SDW-SP2](#)). In CY2012 (last measured in April 2013), Ohio met 1 of the 7 [regional shared goal targets](#) related to meeting health-based standards and significant/major monitoring requirements. (The FY2013 measures and indicators summary provides more details on the results from all of the national and regional measures.) Ohio EPA continues to make significant investments in core aspects of the drinking water program, including sanitary surveys, data management, development of enforcement procedures to ensure consistent implementation, capability assurance, source water protection (SWP) and ground water quality characterization, and development of new rules related to lab reporting requirements, operator certification exams, and other programs. There is a direct correlation between the up-to-date sanitary survey visits to around 4,750 public water systems, low violation rates, innovative programs to ensure compliance, and the dedicated staff in the drinking water program. Staff resources must be maintained to ensure the type of results discussed in this evaluation. In addition to the PWSS program activities conducted in FY 2013 described below, DDAGW continued to expend major resources managing harmful algal bloom (HAB) toxins in PWSs. DDAGW continues to work with PWSs to monitor raw and finished water in accordance with Ohio’s HAB strategy. DDAGW had its first “Do Not Drink” advisory based on finished water detections on a Lake Erie system. DDAGW worked with many state, federal, and academic partners during FFY 2013 to expand knowledge and research into HABs.

NOTE: For each of the activities below (e.g., “rules and primacy,” “sanitary surveys,” etc.), except for “security” and “resources and expertise,” see the associated summary files by clicking on the links for more detailed information about Ohio’s implementation of the national primary drinking water regulations (NPDWRs). The [FY13 annual resource deployment plan](#) includes all of the federal expectations, which is referenced in each of the activity summary files.

1. **Rules and primacy**—Ohio EPA is implementing all of the drinking water rules, with the exception of a few [program disinvestments](#). Ohio does not yet have primacy for the arsenic rule, Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT1), Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2), Ground Water Rule (GWR), Lead and Copper Rule Short-Term Revisions (LCRSTR), and Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 2). However, Ohio

has interim primacy for all of these rules except those for which attorney general certification has not been received (i.e., the new arsenic rule, GWR, and Stage 2). Region 5 will determine whether primacy applications are complete, track primacy submittal/review for all rules, and provide comments on draft rules, as requested. Region 5 completed review of LT1 and LCRSTR and corresponded with Ohio EPA about necessary revisions and will be submitting a primacy approval package to the Regional Administrator in early 2014. R5 agrees to provide Ohio EPA with correspondence on necessary revisions to LT2, Stage 2 D/DBPR, arsenic rule, and GWR by December 31, 2014.

In FY14, Region 5 is tracking [state reporting of certain rule violations](#) (LT2, GWR, LCRSTR, and Stage 2 D/DBPR, as well as 141.130(c) operator certification treatment technique violations). As of October 2013, Ohio had reported to the federal version of the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS/FED):

- LT2: 22 TT violations total (mostly type 41—"failure to maintain microbial treatment"—and two of which are type 45—"failure to address deficiency")
- GWR: 4 TT (2 type 42—"failure to provide treatment," 1 type 45, and 1 type 48—"failure to address contamination") violations, 286 M/R (type 34—"source monitoring") violations, and 3 other (type 20—"failure to consult with state") violations
- Stage 2: 156 M/R violations total (114 type 30—"failure to have monitoring plan"—and 42 type 35 violations—"failure to submit IDSE report")
- LCRSTR: 432 M/R (type 66—"consumer notification") violations
- Stage 1: 0 (type 12—"failure to have a certified operator") violations

In FY 2013, Ohio EPA's DDAGW continued to work on standard operating procedures (SOPs) for many primacy programs. By working on the GWR SOP, DDAGW established improved assessment tools through the hydrogeologic sensitivity assessments and guidance on requiring assessment source water monitoring.

2. **Sanitary surveys**—Ohio EPA will maintain a baseline core of individuals with the technical expertise needed to perform sanitary surveys. Ohio will ensure that sanitary surveys are conducted periodically that, at a minimum, meet frequency requirements specified by rule. Region 5 will track state commitments to conduct sanitary surveys within the federally required intervals through a [sanitary survey completeness high priority query](#), as well as the [national water program measure](#), SDW-01a, which was modified in FY 2014 to include both surface water and ground water systems:

- SURFACE WATER SYSTEMS: As of July 2013, 98.9% (269 out of 272) of the sanitary surveys at CWSs were completed between CY2010 and CY2012. As of October 2013, 86.4% of the surface water CWSs (198 out of 235) completed sanitary surveys between CY2011 and CY2013. In addition, 100% of the surface water non-transient, non-community water systems (NTNCWSs) (9) and transient, non-community water systems (TNCWSs) (8) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2009 and CY2013. States have until March 2014 to report CY2013 sanitary survey data for the national measure SDW-01a. This measure will be modified in FY2014 to include ground water systems in addition to the surface water systems previously tracked.
- GROUND WATER SYSTEMS: As of October 2013, 89.4% of the ground water CWSs (840 out of 940) completed sanitary surveys between CY2011 and CY2013. In addition, 92.6% of the ground water NTNCWSs (600 out of 648) and 93.5% of the ground water TNCWSs (2,513 out of 2,687) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2009 and CY2013.

During FFY 2013, Ohio conducted a total of 1,208 sanitary surveys; 437 at CWSs, 133 at NTNCWSs, and 638 at TNCWSs, including 103 at surface water systems.

2. **Laboratory certification**—The state is expected to: (1) establish and maintain a state program for the certification of laboratories that analyze drinking water contaminants, and (2) assure availability of certified laboratory facilities capable of analyzing all contaminants in the state primary drinking water regulations. The Ohio EPA certification program is managed by their state lab in Ohio EPA's Division of Environmental Services (DES) Laboratory Certification Section. Ohio EPA agrees to certify all laboratories that produce results for compliance with SDWA at least once every three years and will meet all requirements of 40 CFR parts 141 and 142. In FY2013, DDAGW expanded the laboratory compliance program, which should assist in compliance by reducing late reporting while improving data quality reporting. During December 2013, Region 5 conducted an audit of the Ohio EPA principle state lab. Findings and certification decisions should be issued during FY2014.
3. **Compliance and enforcement management**—Ohio EPA is expected to evaluate compliance with all drinking water rules and respond to violations by providing compliance assistance or enforcement as appropriate. Ohio EPA is also expected to keep adequate records of pertinent state decisions. Ohio and Region 5 implement a data exchange to ensure that enforcement resources are targeted at the right PWSs. Region 5 continues to look to states to refer noncompliant PWS. Ohio referred four systems to Region 5 that have not issued CCR type 71 violations on March 28, 2013, three of which have been returned to compliance (RTC'd). The fourth system has submitted its 2012 CCR but still needs to provide its 2010 and 2011 CCRs. Region 5 has been working with the operator, and we anticipate that the system will submit the CCRs soon. R5 provided comments on [Ohio EPA's Compliance Assurance through Enforcement Program SOP](#) in June 2012, and Ohio sent the final version in May 2013. Ohio's drinking water program revised its [DDAGW Enforcement SOP](#), which includes protocols for RTC'ing, SOX'ing, and significant deficiencies, to include more details to address the region's comments and sent this SOP to Region 5 in March 2013. DDAGW continued to emphasize compliance in FY 2013 by developing expedited settlement agreements for systems with certified operator violations and total coliform and nitrate monitoring violations.

[ENFORCEMENT TARGETING TOOL](#): Region 5 tracks state commitments under measure SDWA02 and updates Ohio EPA quarterly. Ohio's 2013 commitment was to address or resolve 78 systems. As of October 2013, Ohio addressed 144 systems (60 from the original 78 on the fixed base list plus an additional 84 that were more recently ≥11). Ohio is commended for this accomplishment. Ohio's 2014 commitment is to address or resolve 42 systems.

[LOGIC MODEL REPORTING TOOL \(LMRT\)](#): As of July 2013, the LMRT indicator O6(1) shows that as of 2012, there were 80 non-health-based (M/R) chem/rad/DBP violations with violation years from 2008 to 2011 with no response reported, the majority of which occurred at small and very small systems. However, six of these 80 violations have been RTC'd based on data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, and nine of these violations are for unregulated contaminants, which may be errors. Sixty-five of these 80 violations indicate no action taken by Ohio EPA as of July 26, 2013. The LMRT indicator O6(1b) shows that as of 2012, there were 7 TCR MCL and 1 TCR M/R violations with violation years from 2007 to 2008 with no response reported, all of which occurred at very small systems. These violations do not appear in the data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, because these violations occurred before April 1, 2009. R5 sent Ohio

information in September about these “no response reported” results per the May semi-annual call discussion.

4. **Data management and reporting**—Ohio EPA is expected to maintain a data management system that tracks requirements for all drinking water rules, which includes the appropriate combination of hardware, software, and personnel to accurately and within a reasonable timeframe identify the inventories (including routine updates of system information), maintain water quality monitoring information, and track compliance with all M/R, MCL, MRDL, TT, PN, and public information requirements. States must report to EPA actions and sample data quarterly and inventory data at least annually in accordance with 40 CFR 142.15. Ohio EPA is using SDWIS/State 3.2 and is reporting with FedRep 3.4. Ohio is commended for being up-to-date on SDWIS/State software upgrades. Ohio continues to meet the quarterly deadlines for reporting data to the national database, SDWIS/Fed-ODS.

TCR AND NITRATE REPORTING: Region 5 is tracking late reporting of TCR and nitrate violations, and as of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 [TCR late reporting query](#) indicates that 99.4% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2011 (2011 total: 1,080), and 99.8% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2012 (2012 total: 1,114). Ohio is commended for this achievement.. As of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 [nitrate late reporting query](#) indicates a decline in the timeliness of reporting between 2011 and 2012—96.5% of nitrate violations were reported on time in 2011 and 3.5% were reported one quarter late (2011 total: 115). In 2012, 85.2% of nitrate violations were reported on time, and 14.8% were reported one quarter late (2012 total: 88).

5. **Security**—Ohio EPA is expected to adopt and implement an adequate plan for the provision of safe drinking water under emergency circumstances including, but not limited to, earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters. Region 5 will review state emergency water plans and consult with the state on implementation capabilities.
6. **Operator certification**—Ohio EPA establishes and maintains minimum professional standards for the operation and maintenance of all public water systems to ensure that properly trained and certified professionals are overseeing the treatment and distribution of safe drinking water and to promote compliance. Ohio annually—by September 30th each year—provides documentation to EPA showing the ongoing implementation of the program to avoid 20% withholding of the DWSRF grant. [Annual reports](#) must include operator certification reporting measures.

Ohio’s implementation of the operator certification program complies with the requirements of the federal operator certification guidelines. Ohio continues to recognize the importance of properly trained and certified operators in protecting public health. Activities taken by Ohio EPA to ensure operators are appropriately certified include overseeing the certification of 5,152 drinking water operators with active certificates. Currently, 99.8 percent of operators are properly certified. There are five classified facilities without an appropriately certified operator.

In FY 2013, the certified operator program expanded its examination process to allow third party providers. While the examinations will begin in FY 2014, rule changes and program development occurred in FY 2013. DDAGW also began implementing a new compliance program for systems without operators. Region 5 commends Ohio EPA for increasing the percentage of systems with properly certified operators in recent years.

7. **Capacity development**—Ohio EPA ensures that new and existing CWSs/NTNCWSs can demonstrate technical, managerial, and financial capacity to operate in compliance with federal and state regulations. Ohio annually—by September 30th each year—provides documentation to Region 5 showing the ongoing implementation of both the new systems program and the existing systems strategy to avoid 20% withholding of the DWSRF capitalization grant. The [annual report](#) should address the new capacity development reporting measures. Every three years, states are required to submit a report to the governor and provide a copy to R5 on the efficacy of the strategy and the progress made toward improving the capacity of water systems in Ohio. The next report to the governor is due October 1, 2014.

DDAGW worked on expanding its capability program in FY 2013 and conducted an overall program re-assessment. As a result, a work group is working through each process to improve capability. The major focus for FY 2013 was drafting screening tools for CWSs and NCWSs to assess general capability. The screening tools will be used to determine what existing systems need to complete a capability assurance plan (CAP).

The Drinking Water Assistance Fund (DWAF) program includes incentives in the DWSRF point structure for effective management, such as utility board training requirements associated with loan awards, conservation, preventative maintenance, regionalization/consolidation, backflow prevention programs, contingency plans, endorsed protection plans, asset management plans, and projects consistent with sustainable growth plans. Ohio EPA uses the DWSRF small systems technical assistance set-aside to fund a contract with Great Lakes RCAP to assist PWSs serving 10,000 people or less with increasing their technical, managerial, and financial capacity, for example, by conducting energy audits and providing training to local officials on asset management and maximizing system efficiency and sustainability with reduced resources, including free, online training available to the public.

8. **Source water assessments and protection**—Ohio EPA's SWP program is funded by the DWSRF state program management set-aside, the CWA Section 106 grant, and state drinking water fees. Ohio EPA reports the number of CWSs with SWP plans and the number of CWSs implementing SWP measures as of June 30 by August 15 each year. Ohio EPA will report this information electronically via SDWIS in FY14. Ohio's program is voluntary. Ohio EPA updates source water assessments, as resources allow, and completes source water assessment reports for new public water systems—Ohio completed 131 source water assessment reports in program year 2013. Ohio EPA also began developing a methodology for deriving substantial implementation of municipal systems from a survey of more than 500 moderate to high vulnerability CWSs. Ohio EPA DDAGW also assists Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water in assessing surface waters designated as a public water supply beneficial use. Ohio's 2014 integrated water quality report will include cyanotoxin data from 2008 to 2012 as one of the drinking water beneficial use impairment indicators for Lake Erie intakes and all other public water systems with river/lake intakes.

[NATIONAL MEASURES SP4A AND SP4B](#): Ohio EPA reported SWP substantial implementation information and met one and surpassed the other of the FY 2013 SWP commitments. Specifically, Ohio minimized risk to public health through SWP for 45% of CWSs (2013 target: 43%) and 64% of the population served by CWSs (2013 target: 64%), where "minimized risk" is achieved by substantial implementation, as determined by the state, of actions in a SWP strategy.

9. **Measures and indicators**—There are multiple [national water program measures](#) in the national program manager guidance that support the “water safe to drink” subobjective 2.1.1 in EPA’s strategic plan, and Region 5 is also tracking several other measures, including those in the [logic model reporting tool](#), [Region 5 shared goals](#), and [Region 5 high priority SDWIS/FED queries](#). The most recent data for Ohio for each of these measures are available via the “measures and indicators” summary file, some of which have been described above in this work plan summary.
10. **Resources and expertise**—Ohio EPA maintains a baseline core of individuals with the technical expertise to carry out all mandatory components of the PWSS program (including engineering plan and specification review and emergency response). Contracts with third parties conducting mandatory components of the PWSS program will make performance expectations clear and will be measured and evaluated by Ohio EPA. Ohio EPA develops and implements a plan to provide adequate funding to carry out all functions of the PWSS program. Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio EPA to engage in resolving temporary [program disinvestments](#).

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Rules and Primacy End-of-Year (EOY) Summary

October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013

Federal funding used: PWSS grant and DWSRF WHP, SSTA, and PWSS set-asides

Ohio EPA contact: Beth Messer, beth.messer@epa.state.oh.us, (614) 644-2752Region 5 contact: Wendy Drake, drake.wendy@epa.gov, (312) 886-6705

NOTE: To use the Quickr links below to access the files, move the cursor over the link and hold down the “Ctrl” key while clicking the left mouse button.

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
1 – SWTRs	SWTR, IESWTR, and FBRR: primacy LT1/LT2: interim primacy; LT1 application review is complete; LT2 application under review	<u>Ohio EPA</u> Judy Stottsberry judy.stottsberry@epa.ohio.gov ; (614) 644-3050 <u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Andrea Porter porter.andrea@epa.gov ; (312) 886-4427	<u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP <u>State Commitment</u> Complete. <u>Region 5 Assistance</u> R5 approved the FBRR primacy package on 1/25/13. R5 review of the LT1 primacy package is complete—we’ve received a signed ORC concurrence memo, and we’ll be submitting a primacy approval package to the Regional Administrator (RA) in early 2014. R5 is reviewing the LT2 application.	<u>Discrepancies</u> Yes, acknowledged (regarding tracking systems that have notified the state in writing within 45 days that IESWTR deficiencies are corrected). See also Quickr link to draft list of program disinvestments . Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments. <u>Milestones</u> Ohio submitted a final primacy revision package for LT2 on 12/4/12. Ohio is reporting LT2 TT violations. As of January 2014, 24 TT violations total (mostly type 41—“failure to maintain microbial treatment”—and three of which are type 45—“failure to address deficiency”) were reported to SDWIS/Fed. Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Ohio EPA utilized federal grant to Texas A&M to conduct SWTR training for small PWSSs.
2 – TCR	primacy (TCR)	<u>Ohio EPA</u> Mark Sheahan	<u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations	<u>Discrepancies</u> None.

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
		mark.sheahan@epa.ohio.gov (614) 644-4827 <u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov ; (312) 886-5253	file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP <u>State Commitment</u> TCR: complete; RTCR: Ohio EPA anticipates seeking interested party comment early 2015, and adopting rules by end of 2015 to be effective 4/1/16. <u>Region 5 Assistance</u> RTCR—R5 will provide a series of webinar training sessions for the states. R5 approved the TCR/PN revisions primacy package on 1/25/13.	<u>Milestones</u> Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Workgroup established to adopt and implement RTCR. Anticipate seeking interested party comment in early 2015 and adopting rules by end of 2015 to be effective 4/1/16. Also, new penalty program for failure to monitor for total coliform and nitrate developed and will begin implementation 1/1/14. Outreach for new penalty program conducted during FFY13 already resulting in improved compliance rates.

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
3 – GWR	awaiting attorney general (AG) certification—R5 submitted a letter to AG requesting certification on May 9, 2013	<p>Ohio EPA Mark Sheahan mark.sheahan@epa.ohio.gov (614) 644-4827</p> <p>U.S. EPA Region 5 Mostafa Noureldin noureldin.mostafa@epa.gov; (312) 353-4735</p> <p>Andrea Porter porter.andrea@epa.gov; (312) 886-4427</p> <p>Joe Janczy janczy.joseph@epa.gov; (608) 267-2763</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p> <p><u>Region 5 Assistance</u> R5 is waiting for AG certification before requesting that an attorney review the final GWR primacy package that Ohio sent on 11/30/10. However, GWDWB will be reviewing the comments and responses submitted on the draft GWR primacy package.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio EPA is using SDWIS/State 3.2 and FedRep 3.4, the latest version of FedRep, to report to SDWIS/Fed ODS. Ohio is currently working on an SOP to ensure consistent reporting of GWR violations.</p> <p>Ohio is reporting GWR violations. As of January 2014, the following violations were reported to SDWIS/Fed: 4 TT (2 type 42—“failure to provide treatment,” 1 type 45—“failure to address deficiency,” and 1 type 48—“failure to address contamination”) violations, 316 M/R (type 34—“source monitoring”) violations, and 2 other (type 20—“failure to consult with state”) violations.</p> <p>Ohio EPA is developing guidance for significant deficiencies, which are identified through sanitary surveys. Until guidance is developed, significant deficiencies will be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: GWR SOP is drafted and undergoing final editorial revisions. Significant deficiency guidance is still in development.</p>
4 – NO ₂ /NO ₃	primacy	<p>Ohio EPA Wendy Sheeran wendy.sheeran@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-2752</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> None.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: New penalty program for failure to monitor for total coliform and nitrate</p>

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
				developed and will begin implementation 1/1/14.
5 – LCR	<p>LCR and LCRMR: primacy</p> <p>LCSTR: interim primacy—application review is complete</p>	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Ken Baughman kenneth.baughman@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-2915</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> States to provide comments on the proposed LCR long-term revisions (LCRLTR), as appropriate.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p> <p><u>Region 5 Assistance</u> The LCRLTR proposed rule should be published in FY2014. R5 will provide training on the proposal and requests for comment.</p> <p>LCRSTR: R5 primacy review is complete—we’ve received a signed ORC concurrence memo, and we’ll be submitting a primacy approval package to the Regional Administrator (RA) in early 2014.</p> <p>R5 continues to work on addressing some of the consumer notice violations at four schools and day cares that are PWSs through the small system initiative that</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio is reporting LCRSTR violations. As of January 2014, 429 M/R (type 66—“consumer notification”) violations were reported to SDWIS/Fed.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Lead and copper SOP in development. Continue to coordinate with R5 on small system initiative.</p>

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
			have not yet been returned to compliance—(1) Ledgemont Elementary School; (2) Tiger Tech Day Care; (3) Creative Learning Preschool, Inc.; and (4) Manchester High School.	
6 – D/DBPRs	<p>Stage 1: primacy</p> <p>Stage 2: awaiting AG certification—R5 submitted a letter to AG requesting certification on May 9, 2013</p>	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Mike Deal mike.deal@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-3387</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Mostafa Nouredin nouredin.mostafa@epa.gov; (312) 353-4735</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> In addition to the other D/DBPR requirements, electronically report all MCL, M/R TT and PN violations and inventory updates to SDWIS/Fed for all public water systems, including operator certification treatment technique violations per 141.130(c).</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> Yes, acknowledged (regarding reporting type 12 violations for failure to have a certified operator as required by Stage 1). Ohio does issue violations for failure to have an operator, but they are not DBP TT violations. See also Quickr link to draft list of program disinvestments.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio EPA submitted the Stage 2 primacy package to R5 on January 18, 2013 per R5's request, even though the AG certification has not yet been received.</p> <p>Ohio is reporting Stage 2 violations. As of January 2014, the following violations were reported to SDWIS/Fed: 158 M/R violations total (114 type 30 violations—"failure to have monitoring plan"—42 type 35 violations—"failure to submit IDSE report"—and 2 type 27 violations). There were no Stage 2 MCL/MRDL violations reported to SDWIS/Fed as of January 2014. In addition, as noted above, as of January 2014, Ohio was not reporting to SDWIS/Fed Stage 1 type 12 TT violations when a system is not operated by a state-approved qualified operator (141.130(c)).</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: MCL violations under Stage 2 monitoring have begun to be reported and are</p>

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
				being addressed, including through enforcement actions where necessary. Chem/rad SOP under revision to incorporate Stage 2 revisions.
7 – IOCs	<p>primacy, except for the new arsenic rule</p> <p>arsenic rule: awaiting AG certification—R5 submitted a letter to AG requesting certification on May 9, 2013</p>	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Kathy Pinto kathy.pinto@epa.ohio.gov ; (614) 644-3558</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p> <p>As: Kim Harris harris.kimberly@epa.gov; (312) 886-4239</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio EPA submitted a second addendum to the 2007 primacy application for the arsenic rule (related to corrections made by 8/1/10) on 10/26/12 per Region 5's request (without the AG certification). Ohio EPA will submit the AG certification when received.</p>
8 – Radio-nuclides	primacy	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Wendy Sheeran wendy.sheeran@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-2752</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio's radionuclides primacy package submitted on February 5, 2009, was approved on May 9, 2012.</p>
9 – SOCs	primacy	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Wendy Sheeran wendy.sheeran@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-2752</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> None.</p>
10 – VOCs	primacy	<u>Ohio EPA</u>	<u>Federal Expectations</u>	<u>Discrepancies</u>

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
		<p>Mike Deal mike.deal@epa.ohio.gov; (614) 644-3387</p> <p>U.S. EPA Region 5 Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p>	<p>See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p>State Commitment Complete.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> None.</p>
11 – Sodium	N/A	<p>Ohio EPA Holly Kaloz holly.kaloz@epa.state.oh.us; (614) 644-2760</p> <p>Mike Perriguet mike.perriguet@epa.state.oh.us; (614) 644-3124</p> <p>U.S. EPA Region 5 Miguel Del Toral deltoral.miguel@epa.gov; (312) 886-5253</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p>State Commitment Complete.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> None. Ohio EPA is not implementing this rule. There is not a federal MCL or requirement to perform sodium monitoring. Ohio would have to adopt rules more stringent than the federal rules to require sampling. Ohio doesn't intend to adopt rules for sodium. Sodium is required for new well approval. Ohio references the federal guidance level of 20 mg/L in letters regarding new well results.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> None.</p>
12 – PN	primacy	<p>Ohio EPA Holly Kaloz holly.kaloz@epa.state.oh.us; (614) 644-2760</p> <p>Mike Perriguet mike.perriguet@epa.state.oh.us; (614) 644-3124</p> <p>U.S. EPA Region 5 Kristina Bell bell.kristina@epa.gov; (312) 886-7489</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p>State Commitment Partial.</p> <p><u>Region 5 Assistance</u> R5 approved the TCR/PN revisions primacy package on 1/25/13.</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> Yes, acknowledged (regarding not reporting PN tier 2 and tier 3 violations). See also Quickr link to draft list of program disinvestments. Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio has trained staff and is using SDWIS/State to track and create PN schedules. Ohio has begun issuing violations for Tier 1 PN violations and is continuing to work on providing consistent application of the program across the state.</p>

RULE	LEGAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACTS	EXPECTATIONS	EVALUATION
				Ohio EPA reports federal Tier 1 PN violations. Ohio EPA does track the request for PN and when the PN is received for Tier 2 and 3 violations, but does not report these PN violations. Ohio will not expand the PN violation program until full implementation of the Tier 1 program is complete.
13 – CCR	primacy	<p><u>Ohio EPA</u> Holly Kaloz holly.kaloz@epa.state.oh.us; (614) 644-2760</p> <p><u>U.S. EPA Region 5</u> Janet Kuefler kuefler.janet@epa.gov; (312) 886-0123</p>	<p><u>Federal Expectations</u> See the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p> <p><u>State Commitment</u> Partial.</p> <p><u>Region 5 Assistance</u> A memorandum signed on January 3, 2013, clarifies electronic delivery options for CCRs (click this link).</p>	<p><u>Discrepancies</u> Yes, acknowledged (related to CCR content reviews and referrals). Ohio EPA is not conducting content reviews of CCRs. Ohio EPA recently centralized the CCR program. NOVS are sent to systems failing to issue a CCR. Further enforcement is not prioritized unless included as part of another enforcement action. See also Quickr link to draft list of program disinvestments. Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments.</p> <p><u>Milestones</u> Ohio referred four systems to Region 5 that have not issued CCR type 71 violations on March 28, 2013. Three of the four systems have been returned to compliance (RTC'd). The fourth system has submitted its 2012 CCR but still needs to provide its 2010 and 2011 CCRs. Region 5 has been working with the operator, and we anticipate that the system will submit the CCRs soon.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Implemented electronic delivery of CCR.</p>

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Sanitary Survey Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant	
State Contact	Susan Schell, susan.schell@epa.ohio.gov , (614) 644-2752
EPA Region 5 Contact	Mostafa Nouredin, nouredin.mostafa@epa.gov , (312) 353-4735
Expectations	<p>Ohio EPA will maintain a baseline core of individuals with the technical expertise needed to perform sanitary surveys.</p> <p>Ohio EPA will ensure sanitary surveys are conducted periodically that, at a minimum, meet frequency requirements specified by rule.</p> <p>Ohio EPA will ensure that under the Ground Water Rule, sanitary surveys at ground water systems include an evaluation of the: (1) source; (2) treatment; (3) distribution system; (4) finished water storage; (5) pumps, pump facilities, and controls; (6) monitoring, reporting, and data verification; (7) system management and operation; and (8) operator compliance with state requirements.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>
Region 5 Assistance	Track state commitments under measure SDWA-01a and update Ohio EPA quarterly, engaging in discussion with states on progress as needed. (NOTE: This national measure was modified in FY14 to include both surface water and ground water systems.) Help arrange training as requested. See also the federal expectations file link above.
Discrepancies	<p>Yes, acknowledged. Ohio EPA is not reporting sanitary survey violations at systems when the state does not conduct a sanitary survey within the federally required intervals. In addition, Ohio EPA will not commit to electronically tracking how many systems either have met or are meeting the requirement that systems notify the state in writing within 45 days that IESWTR deficiencies identified in the sanitary surveys are corrected. See the Quickr link to Ohio PWSS program disinvestments.</p> <p>Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments.</p>
Milestones	None.
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>Tracking responses to sanitary surveys—some district offices use a separate survey schedule tracker and other district offices have individual inspectors tracking.</p> <p>SURFACE WATER SYSTEMS: As of July 2013, 98.9% (269 out of 272) of the sanitary surveys at CWSs were completed between CY2010 and CY2012. As of October 2013, 86.4% of the surface water CWSs (198 out of 235) completed sanitary surveys between CY2011 and CY2013. In addition, 100% of the surface water NTNCWSs (9) and TNCWSs (8) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2009 and CY2013. . States have until March 2014 to report CY2013 sanitary survey data for the national measure</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM SANITARY SURVEY WORK PLAN EOY SUMMARY

	<p>SDW-01a. This measure will be modified in FY14 to include ground water systems in addition to the surface water systems previously tracked.</p> <p>GROUND WATER SYSTEMS: As of October 2013, 89.4% of the ground water CWSs (840 out of 940) completed sanitary surveys between CY2011 and CY2013. In addition, 92.6% of the ground water NTNCWSs (600 out of 648) and 93.5% of the ground water TNCWSs (2,513 out of 2,687) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2009 and CY2013.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Surveys conducted during FFY 2013 met the eight survey components. During FFY 2013, Ohio conducted a total of 1,208 sanitary surveys; 437 at CWSs, 133 at NTNCWSs, and 638 at TNCWSs, including 103 at surface water systems.</p>
Relevant Attachments	<p><u>Quickr link to Ohio EPA's capability assurance evaluation form</u> (10/08), which is used during sanitary surveys.</p> <p><u>Quickr link to Ohio EPA's sanitary survey form.</u></p> <p><u>Quickr link to Ohio EPA's sanitary survey manual.</u> As of December 2013, significant deficiency guidance was in development.</p> <p>See also Ohio's <u>sanitary survey guidance for small systems</u> and a <u>Ohio Section AWWA 2007 newsletter article</u> about Ohio's sanitary survey process change.</p>

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Laboratory Certification Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant	
State Contact	Nik Dzamov Ohio EPA Division of Environmental Services (DES) Laboratory Certification Section nikola.dzamov@epa.ohio.gov (614) 644-4068
EPA Region 5 Contact	Al Alwan, Laboratory Certification Program Manager alwan.al@epa.gov (312) 353-2004
Expectations	<p>All laboratories that produce results for compliance with SDWA are certified by the State to which those results are reported. These certifications shall be done at a frequency of at least once every three years and will meet all requirements of 40 C.F.R. parts 141 and 142.</p> <p>EPA recommends that the State have a process for ensuring capacity to analyze at the Principal State Lab or commercial labs all NPDWR parameters that are required to be sampled in the State.</p> <p>In order to maintain primacy, the States must comply with 40 CFR 142.10, which includes the following provisions: 142.10(b)(3)(i) and 142.10(b)(4).</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>
Region 5 Assistance	<p>During December 2013, Region 5 conducted an audit of the Ohio EPA principle state lab. Findings and certification decisions should be issued during FY2014.</p> <p>The Ohio Department of Health laboratory stopped its radiochemistry analysis of drinking water samples on December 31, 2010, because of the expense in replacing aging analytical equipment, and the state has designated the Wisconsin State Lab of Hygiene, Underwriters Laboratories Inc., and Summit Environmental Technologies Inc. as acceptable laboratories for radiochemistry analysis. Ohio EPA uses the State of New York as a third-party assessor for asbestos and <i>Cryptosporidium</i> for one lab, as well as Region 5 for dioxin.</p>
Discrepancies	None.
Milestones	None.
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>The Ohio EPA certification program is managed by their state lab. Ohio EPA doesn't anticipate a shortage of certification officers—they have been able to fill recently vacated positions.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Upon completion of updates to the microbiological and chemical procedural manuals, Ohio will be revising the laboratory certification rules to include references to these manuals.</p> <p>In FFY13, Ohio began implementing a new program to improve laboratory</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM LABORATORY CERTIFICATION WORK PLAN EOY SUMMARY

	<p>reporting performance. Ohio began sending notices of violation (NOVs) to labs for late reporting on a quarterly basis and intends to expand the program to address inaccurate reporting in the future.</p> <p>Ohio EPA plans to incorporate a newly adopted Laboratory Certification Program (LCP) database (DESLITS) to track proficiency testing (PT) sample unacceptable results more efficiently.</p>
Relevant Attachments	<p><i>Quickr link to laboratory certification program annual questionnaire</i> (2013)</p> <p><i>Quickr link to memo from the R5 Water Division to EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water re. SOC monitoring trigger levels</i> (November 2010)</p> <p>Ohio EPA's certified laboratories website: http://epa.ohio.gov/ddagw/labcert.aspx</p>

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Enforcement and Compliance Assistance Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant, DWSRF PWSS set-aside	
State Contact	Name: Holly Kaloz Email: holly.kaloz@epa.ohio.gov Telephone Number: (614) 644-2760
EPA Region 5 Contact	Name: Frank Lagunas Email: lagunas.frank@epa.gov Telephone Number: (312) 886-4466
Expectations	<p>Evaluate compliance with all rules, and respond to violations by providing compliance assistance or enforcement as appropriate. Keep adequate records of pertinent state decisions. R5 continues to look to states to refer noncompliant PWS.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>
Region 5 Assistance	<p>Each quarter, send Ohio EPA the latest Enforcement Targeting Tool (ETT) data along with a request for referrals and updates on priority systems. R5 integrates these updates into reports before the next request is sent out. Ohio and R5 implement a data exchange with each quarterly SDWIS data freeze to generate more real-time ETT scores and to ensure that enforcement resources are targeted at the right PWSs.</p> <p>Assist with referrals, enhanced data exchange, analysis, data clean-up, or other joint efforts as requested by Ohio EPA.</p> <p>Track state commitments under measure SDWA02 and update Ohio EPA quarterly, engaging in discussion with states on progress as needed.</p> <p>See also the link to the federal expectations file above.</p>
Discrepancies	<p>Yes, acknowledged (i.e., sanitary surveys, PN, and CCR). See the Quickr link to Ohio PWSS program disinvestments. Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio EPA to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments.</p>
Milestones	<p>Each quarter, Ohio EPA updates SDWIS/FED with state enforcement data.</p> <p>Annually, by July 1, prepare and submit an ACR.</p> <p>In 2014, R5 will conduct EV audits in OH and IL, as resources allow.</p> <p>Ohio's 2013 ETT commitment is to address or resolve 78 systems. The October 2013 freeze shows 144 systems addressed (60 from the original 78 on the fixed base list plus an additional 84 that were more recently >=11). Ohio is commended for this accomplishment. Ohio's 2014 commitment is to address or resolve 42 systems.</p> <p>Ohio EPA used the ETT list to address systems with a score equal to or greater than 11 and is moving to address systems before reaching a score of 11.</p>

	<p>Beginning January 1, 2014, PWSs that fail to monitor for total coliform and nitrate will receive a penalty of \$150 or more for each monitoring violation.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: In FFY 2013, Ohio EPA used DWSRF set-aside money for staff to address return to compliance activities.</p> <p>R5 provided comments on Ohio's compliance and enforcement strategy in June 2012, and Ohio sent the final version in May 2013. Ohio revised its enforcement SOP, which includes protocols for RTC'ing, SOX'ing, and significant deficiencies, to include more details to address the region's comments and sent this SOP (dated February 1, 2013) to R5 on March 19, 2013.</p> <p>See also the above link to the federal expectations file.</p>
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>As of July 2013, the logic model reporting tool indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – O6(1) shows that as of 2012, there were 80 non-health-based (M/R) chem/rad/DBP violations with violation years from 2008 to 2011 with no response reported, the majority of which occurred at small and very small systems. However, six of these 80 violations have been RTC'd based on data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, and nine of these violations are for unregulated contaminants, which may be errors. Sixty-five of these 80 violations indicate no action taken by Ohio EPA as of July 26, 2013. – O6(1b) shows that as of 2012, there were 7 TCR MCL and 1 TCR M/R violations with violation years from 2007 to 2008 with no response reported, all of which occurred at very small systems. These violations do not appear in the data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, because these violations occurred before April 1, 2009. – O6(2b) shows that the majority of tier 1 violations that occurred between 2008 and 2012—84 percent (114 out of 136 violations)—were RTC'd within one year. Of these tier 1 violations, 30 percent (16 out of 54) of the LT1 TT violations and 9 percent (6 out of 66) of the TCR MCL violations took more than one year to RTC; all of the nitrate violations were RTC'd within one year. The majority of tier 2 violations—81 percent (1,418 out of 1,744) were RTC'd within one year. The majority of tier 3 violations—85 percent (5,741 out of 6,772)—were RTC'd within one year. <p>Ohio uses the ability to condition a license to operate in addition to traditional enforcement actions, such as bilateral compliance agreements and findings and orders. In FFY 2013, Ohio developed a process to send expedited settlement agreements with a penalty for PWSs with type 23 or 25 microbiological violations and nitrate monitoring violations. Outreach conducted in FFY13 appears to be already resulting in increased compliance rates.</p> <p>R5 maintains a direct enforcement role in our states and continues to pursue with Ohio EPA how to most effectively coordinate those efforts. In particular, R5 continues to look to states to refer noncompliant PWS. Ohio referred four systems to Region 5 that have not issued CCR type 71 violations on March 28, 2013. Ohio will not be referring type 72 violations, which are related to content. As of January 2014, three of the four referred CCR violations have been RTC'd—Camplands Water LLC, Green Meadows MHP, and Stateline Agri Inc. PWS.</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE EOY SUMMARY

	<p>Stateline Agri Inc. PWS has had a new owner and operator since late 2013. The PWS is now named North Town Apts (OH1901012). Region 5 has conferred with Ohio regarding this case to determine next steps. Because there is a change in ownership, Region 5 cannot take any further action on its current Administrative Order (AO). Region 5's AO only covered the 2010 and 2011 CCRs, and these violations will be returned to compliance since the responsible party is no longer at the PWS. The last system—North Hampton Village PWS—has provided Region 5 with its 2012 CCR but not the 2010 and 2011 CCRs required in our Order. We have been working with the operator and anticipate receiving the CCRs soon.</p>
Relevant Attachments	<p><u>Quickr link to enforcement SOPs</u>—This link includes Ohio EPA's final Compliance Assurance through Enforcement Program SOP, DDAGW's Enforcement SOP, as well as EPA's June 2012 comments on the draft version of the compliance assurance through enforcement program SOP (see Addendum B for the drinking water-specific guidance)</p> <p><u>Quickr link to Ohio EPA's Annual Compliance Reports</u> (2010, 2011, and 2012)</p> <p><u>Quickr link to program review for Ohio EPA DDAGW—final report</u> (December 2008)</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING WORK PLAN EOY SUMMARY
FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Data Management and Reporting Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant		
State Contact	Name: Rick Magni Email: rick.magni@epa.ohio.gov Telephone Number: (614) 644-2772	
EPA Region 5 Contact	Name: Kris Werbach (SDWIS/Fed reporting) Email: werbach.kristine@epa.gov Telephone Number: (312) 886-6527	Name: Andrea Porter (high priority queries) Email: porter.andrea@epa.gov Telephone Number: (312) 886-4427
	Name: Wendy Drake (data verifications, program/file reviews) Email: drake.wendy@epa.gov Telephone Number: (312) 886-6705	Name: Email: Telephone Number:
Expectations	Ohio will maintain a database that tracks public water systems inventory, actions, and violations for all federal rules. Ohio will update to the most recent version of FedRep as new releases are made, conduct timely reporting on a quarterly basis to Region 5 (FFYQ1 – February 15, FFYQ2 – May 15, FFYQ3 – August 15, and FFYQ4 – November 15), and correct any reporting errors as soon as possible. States must report to EPA actions and sample data quarterly and inventory data at least annually in accordance with 40 CFR 142.15. These data must be reported in XML format and utilize the Central Data Exchange (CDX) as the media for data transfer to U.S. EPA. See the expectations file for additional information: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP	
Region 5 Assistance	GWDWB to follow-up with Ohio EPA regarding the status of SDWIS/State compatibility with the ESS module. R5 expects that compliance determination and violation reporting training (CDVRT) will be conducted when all of the CDVRT modules are completed (tentatively late FY14). Region 5 will assist states with resolving data quality issues, as appropriate. The inventory reporting guidance document is available via the ASDWA website. R5 will share this document with states. See also the federal expectations file attached above.	
Discrepancies	Yes, there are acknowledged discrepancies. See Quickr link to Ohio PWSS program disinvestments for more information. Region 5 tracks progress related to state and EPA efforts to obtain additional resources necessary to enable Ohio to engage in resolving program discrepancies and temporary disinvestments.	
Milestones	R5 requests that states copy the region when responding to the annual headquarters survey asking about which states are using various SDWIS/State components. Ohio EPA is using SDWIS/State 3.2 and FedRep 3.4 to report to SDWIS/Fed ODS. Ohio is commended for being up-to-date on SDWIS/State software upgrades. Ohio EPA can report all GWR violations now. Ohio is currently working on an SOP to ensure consistent reporting of GWR violations.	

	<p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Ohio EPA is using electronic data for most compliance determinations and may consider facility analyte levels (FANLS) for SWTR, DBPs, and Lead and Copper in FFY 2014. Ohio won't be moving to FANLS in the next program year.</p> <p>SOPS are drafted or being drafted for some SDWIS components, such as Chem/Rad, TCR, GWR and some of Lead and Copper related to SOX'ing and RTC'ing violations and significant deficiencies. The TCR SOP is complete. The Chem/Rad SOP is under revision to incorporate Stage 2. The GWR SOP is undergoing final editorial revisions. The Lead and Copper SOP should be completed in SFY 2014. DDAGW worked on the SOP for significant deficiencies through FFY 2013. The Rescind/RTC SOP is under development.</p> <p>For FFY 2013, Ohio will have a procedure for rescinding violations when data is submitted late. If a PWS submits data late, the M/R violation is rescinded, but the letter will reflect that a reporting violation still exists. This is completed.</p> <p>Ohio EPA applied for and received the National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN) 2013 grant to make Drinking Water Watch (DWW) available to external customers. Ohio will be making DWW public once SDWIS Prime is completed and web services are available for DWW to consume the data. Also included in the NEIEN grant was the installation of Windsor Solutions' Site Profiler web application. Site Profiler will also publish SDWIS data out to the web along with other environmental program data in a GIS interface. Included in this will be links to Ohio's electronic document management system, allowing the public to retrieve and view non-compliance and other regulatory documents.</p> <p>Ohio is phasing in a requirement that PWSs will need to use new reporting applications to submit their monthly operating reports. This requirement is being phased in based on system population, with the largest systems required to begin by July 1, 2012, and the smallest systems by July 1, 2014.</p> <p>See also federal expectations file above.</p>
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>Ohio continues to meet the quarterly deadlines for reporting data to the national database, SDWIS/Fed-ODS, and is making corrections to identified data quality errors in a timely manner.</p> <p>As of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 TCR late reporting query indicates that 99.4% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2011 (2011 total: 1,080), and 99.8% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2012 (2012 total: 1,114). Ohio is commended for this achievement.</p> <p>As of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 nitrate late reporting query indicates a decline in the timeliness of reporting between 2011 and 2012—96.5% of nitrate violations were reported on time in 2011 and 3.5% were reported one quarter late (2011 total: 115). In 2012, 85.2% of nitrate violations were reported on time, and 14.8% were reported one quarter late (2012 total: 88).</p> <p>The state adopted laboratory certification rules in September 2009 requiring labs to electronically report data to the state using an electronic Drinking Water Reports (eDWR) system (effective July 2010). In FFY 2013, DDAGW worked to ensure systems</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING WORK PLAN EOY SUMMARY

	were reporting electronically and began outreach to those with requirements beginning in 2014.
Relevant Attachments	<i>Quickr link to program review for Ohio EPA DDAGW—final report</i> (December 2008) <i>Quickr link to Ohio's FY13 measures and indicators summary</i>

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Operator Certification Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant	
State Contact	Andy Barienbrock andrew.barienbrock@epa.ohio.gov (614) 728-1216
EPA Region 5 Contact	Jennifer Crooks crooks.jennifer@epa.gov (312) 886-0244
Expectations	<p>States establish and maintain minimum professional standards for the operation and maintenance of all public water systems to ensure that properly trained and certified professionals are overseeing the treatment and distribution of safe drinking water and to promote compliance.</p> <p>Provide documentation to U.S. EPA showing the ongoing implementation of the program to avoid 20% withholding of the DWSRF grant. Annual reports must include operator certification reporting measures.</p> <p>For operators of CWSs and NTNCWSs: Provide training and certification opportunities for new operators and for operators upgrading and renewing certification, including training to ensure sustainable water utilities and supplies.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>
Region 5 Assistance	R5 will provide outreach material on sustainable water utilities and supplies to operators and technical assistance providers, in coordination with the state.
Discrepancies	None.
Milestones	None.
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>EPA approved Ohio's 2013 operator certification program annual report. Ohio's implementation of the operator certification program complies with the requirements of the federal operator certification guidelines. Ohio continues to recognize the importance of properly trained and certified operators in protecting public health.</p> <p>To fulfill a need to make convenient exam options available to operators, Ohio drafted rules documenting criteria to facilitate a process by which third party exam providers would be able to request approval from the state to give exams to operators in Ohio. These rules became effective in January 1, 2013. The Association of Boards of Certification (ABC) was approved as an examination provider and will begin providing examinations in 5 locations across the state in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014. Ohio EPA will still provide paper and pencil examinations two times per year in a central location.</p> <p>Ohio developed a data management system to track all certified operators and created an e-application and e-payment system for certified operators. Both systems are complete; however, Ohio is working with the information technology section to eliminate bugs and maximize the effectiveness of the systems.</p>

	<p>Activities taken by Ohio EPA to ensure operators are appropriately certified include overseeing the certification of 5,152 drinking water operators with active certificates. Currently, 99.8 percent of operators are properly certified. There are five classified facilities without an appropriately certified operator.</p> <p>Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Developed and implemented a web-based multi-media training for Class I operators to be used for continuing education and exam preparation. Provided free web-based training for Class A operators. Developed an e-application and payment system, which can be used for operator exam applications, renewal applications, contact hour applications, and contact hour tracking for individual operators. DDAGW began implementing a new compliance program for systems without operators. If a PWS fails to address notices of violation, DDAGW proposes an expedited settlement agreement, which requires the system to hire an appropriately certified operator and pay a \$1,000 fine. In FY 2013, the certified operator program expanded its examination process to allow third party providers. While the examinations will begin in FY 2014, rule changes and program development occurred in FY 2013.</p> <p>Region 5 commends Ohio EPA for increasing the percentage of systems with properly certified operators in recent years.</p> <p>Region 5 requests that the 2014 annual operator certification report include only details related to the drinking water program—and not the wastewater program. Quickr link to the Region 5 approval letters (2011, 2012, and 2013)</p> <p>Here are four suggestions from R5 on how to improve Ohio's already solid operator certification program, the first two of which are focused on asset management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train water operators how to maintain and monitor inventory and replacement life-cycle information for system components; 2. Teach water operators how to use system inventory and replacement life-cycle information to produce critical need projections for decision-makers; 3. Inform managers and municipal officials about the benefits and incentives to hire returning veterans; and 4. Train operators how to conduct Level 1 assessments to satisfy Revised Total Coliform Rule requirements. <p>Quickr link to Ohio's operator certification annual report and ERG reports (2011, 2012, and 2013)</p>
Relevant Attachments	<p>Ohio EPA certified operators website: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/ddagw/opcert.aspx</p>

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT EOY SUMMARY

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Capacity Development Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: PWSS grant, small systems technical assistance and PWSS set-asides	
State Contact	Susan Schell susan.schell@epa.ohio.gov (614) 752-9725
EPA Region 5 Contact	Sahba Rouhani rouhani.sahba@epa.gov (312) 886-0245
Expectations	<p>Ohio EPA ensures that new and existing CWSs/NTNCWSs can demonstrate technical, managerial, and financial capacity to operate in compliance with federal and state regulations.</p> <p>Ohio EPA provides a report to R5 annually, by September 30th each year, showing the ongoing implementation of both the new systems program and the existing systems strategy to avoid 20% withholding of the DWSRF capitalization grant. The report should address the new capacity development reporting measures.</p> <p>Every three years, submit a report to the governor and provide a copy to R5 on the efficacy of the strategy and the progress made toward improving the capacity of water systems in Ohio. The report to the governor is due October 1, 2014.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>
Region 5 Assistance	<p>R5 will send a reminder to Ohio EPA about the capacity development annual report in August, annually.</p> <p>R5 will send a reminder to Ohio about the report to the governor in August 2014.</p> <p>R5 sustainable water infrastructure (SWI) workgroup will provide training and outreach materials to water system operators and technical assistance providers, in coordination with Ohio, to promote SWI activities including those related to water and/or energy efficiency, asset management, and climate change adaptation and mitigation activities. SWI is important to the success of other PWSS program activities, including source water protection, DWSRF, operator certification, and all-hazards resilience approaches.</p> <p>See also the link to the federal expectations file above.</p>
Discrepancies	None.
Milestones	<p>Annually provide documentation to R5 showing the ongoing implementation of both the new systems program and the existing systems strategy. Due dates: September 30, 2014 and September 30, 2015</p> <p>The next report to the governor is due October 1, 2014.</p>
Self-Assessment	Ohio EPA 2013 EOY: Activities in program year 2013 taken by Ohio EPA to

and Evaluation	<p>strengthen system capacity included establishing a capability assurance workgroup to improve all PWS capability. In FFY 2013, the workgroup worked on capability screening tools for systems that hit certain triggers. The screening tool will indicate areas for improvement and be used to determine if a capability assurance plan (CAP) is needed.</p> <p>Ohio EPA has a contract with Great Lakes Rural Community Assistance Program (RCAP) to conduct energy audits and provide training to local officials on asset management and maximizing system efficiency and sustainability with reduced resources. RCAP offered free, online training available to the public in program year 2013. Ohio EPA also participates in sustainable infrastructure efforts of the Ohio Water Resources Council. RCAP began an intensive technical assistance pilot project in 2012 for systems lacking technical, managerial, and financial capacity. The intensive technical assistance projects were included in the 2013 program year.</p> <p>The Drinking Water Assistance Fund (DWAF) program includes incentives in the SRF point structure for effective management, such as utility board training, conservation, preventative maintenance, regionalization/consolidation, backflow prevention programs, contingency plans, endorsed protection plans, asset management plans, projects consistent with sustainable growth plans, etc. In FY2013, a short-term DWAF program goal is to give priority to projects on the Intended Projects List (IPL) identified as the initial installation of water meters where none previously existed at a PWS. In addition, the DWAF disadvantaged community subsidy requires that recipients take the board training within 60 days of the loan award.</p> <p>Two new positions have been established, including a capability assurance position to help develop a more comprehensive strategy for providing technical, managerial, and financial assistance to public water systems (PWSs), as well as a statewide lead engineer position.</p> <p><u>Quickr link to Region 5 approval letters</u> (2011 and 2012)</p> <p><u>Ohio's capability assurance strategy annual reports</u> (2011, 2012, and 2013)</p> <p><u>Quickr link to Ohio's capability assurance strategy triennial report to the governor</u> (September 2011)</p>
Relevant Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quickr links to <u>Ohio EPA's small systems technical assistance set-aside reports</u> (2011, 2012, and 2013) and <u>U.S. EPA DWSRF set-aside review reports</u> (2008-2012) that document work conducted under the RCAP contract ▪ Ohio's capability assurance website: http://epa.ohio.gov/ddagw/financialassistance.aspx (see the capability assurance tab) ▪ Ohio's capability assurance program guidelines (October 1999): http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/28/Documents/dwaf/eng03.pdf ▪ <u>Quickr link to Ohio's capability assurance plan for new PWSs</u> (September 1999)

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM SOURCE WATER PROTECTION EOY SUMMARY

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Source Water Protection Summary October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013 Federal funding used: DWSRF WHPP set-aside, CWA Section 106, and state drinking water fee		
State Contacts	Jeff Patzke jeff.patzke@epa.ohio.gov (614) 644-3029	Barb Lubberger barbara.lubberger@epa.ohio.gov (614) 644-2863
EPA Region 5 Contacts	William Spaulding spaulding.william@epa.gov (312) 886-9262	Cary McElhinney mcelhinney.cary@epa.gov (312) 886-4313
Expectations	<p>Report the number of CWSs with source water protection (SWP) plans and the number of CWSs implementing SWP measures (electronically via SDWIS, if possible) as of June 30 by August 15.</p> <p>SDW-SP4a: By FY2013, Ohio's target is to minimize risk to public health through source water protection for 43 percent of CWSs (i.e., "minimized risk" achieved by substantial implementation, as determined by the state, of actions in a source water protection strategy).</p> <p>SDW-SP4b: By FY2013, Ohio's target is to minimize risk to public health through source water protection for 64 percent of the population served by CWSs (i.e., "minimized risk" achieved by substantial implementation, as determined by the state, of actions in a source water protection strategy).</p> <p>Annually report on SWP activities conducted with Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) set-aside funding.</p> <p>Update source water assessments, as resources allow, and complete source water assessment reports for new public water systems.</p> <p>The next annual meeting will be held in Chicago on April 8-10, 2014.</p> <p>See also the federal expectations file: Quickr link to Ohio FY2013 ARDP</p>	
Program successes and challenges	<p><u>SUCCESSSES:</u> Ohio EPA began developing a methodology for deriving substantial implementation of municipal systems from a survey of more than 500 moderate to high vulnerability CWSs. Ohio EPA DDAGW also assists Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water in assessing surface waters designated as a public water supply beneficial use. For example, Ohio's 2014 integrated water quality report will include cyanotoxin data from 2008 to 2012 as one of the drinking water beneficial use impairment indicators for Lake Erie intakes and all other public water systems with river/lake intakes. Ohio uses CWA Section 106 funds to support an ambient ground water monitoring network, among other projects (for example, see article in Region 5's November 2012 water quality monitoring newsletter—Quickr link, pages 4-5). See also the "self-assessment and evaluation" section below for more program successes.</p> <p><u>CHALLENGES:</u> Ohio's SWP program is voluntary, with the exception that community water systems are required to complete or update a source water protection plan within two years after Ohio EPA approves new well construction. Several issues that</p>	

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM SOURCE WATER PROTECTION EOY SUMMARY

	<p>Ohio EPA is working to address include contamination to wells from salt storage facilities in wellhead protection (WHP) areas (Ohio worked on developing salt storage guidance in state program year (SPY) 2012; see draft available from the Ohio Water Resources Council website), as well as potential contamination from toxic algae blooms (see Ohio's HAB website for more information), geothermal wells, and hydraulic fracturing activities.</p>
Region 5 Assistance	<p>Encourage data sharing with other programs to prioritize permitting and compliance activities in source water areas, for example.</p> <p>Review state 303(d) and 305(b) reports (or integrated reports) to recommend opportunities for source water protection; continue to work with the Clean Water Act program to encourage the assessment of waters for drinking water use. In FY2013, the Ground Water and Drinking Water Branch provided comments on Ohio's nutrient reduction strategy, a watershed action plan (Lower Muskingum River Watershed Management Plan: Southern Watershed Action Plan), and a TMDL (Lima).</p> <p>R5 continues to solicit proposals from states for SWP workshops.</p> <p>EPA continues to occasionally provide SWP brochures and webinars.</p> <p>See also the link to the federal expectations file above.</p>
Self-Assessment and Evaluation	<p>Ohio EPA reported SWP substantial implementation information met the FY13 commitments for the two SWP measures (SP4a and SP4b). Specifically, Ohio minimized risk to public health through SWP for 45% of CWSs (2013 target: 43%) and 64% of the population served by CWSs (2013 target: 64%), where "minimized risk" is achieved by substantial implementation, as determined by the state, of actions in a SWP strategy. Ohio will report these measures through SDWIS in FY14.</p> <p>As of October 2012, there are a total of 553 substantially implementing CWSs, which includes CWSs that purchase water from systems that are substantially implementing protective strategies.</p> <p>In SPY 2013, Ohio completed 131 source water assessment reports and endorsed 10 of the 12 SWP plans developed by municipal PWSs that were received during SPY 2013. Ohio received and accepted checklist-style protection plans from 80 non-municipal systems in SPY 2013. In addition, Ohio is commended for reviewing and providing comments on district office workplans documenting SWP implementation; coordinating with the Farm Service Agency and the Ohio Rural Water Association in the development of local source water protection plans; coordinating with the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO) to organize an information session for industry representatives along the Upper Ohio River; revising previous SWP area delineations; conducting SWP planning workshops for multiple municipalities; conducting analyses, site inspections, and investigations of salt storage facilities; and coordinating with ODNR and reviewing planned routes for new oil and gas pipelines and sharing findings with PWSs with SWP areas within or next to the proposed routes. Ohio also contributed an article for a Region 5 water quality monitoring newsletter about their ground water monitoring initiative funded by CWA Section 106, which was published in November 2012. Quickr link to November 2012 Region 5 water quality monitoring newsletter.</p>

Relevant Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Quickr links to Ohio EPA's WHP set-aside reports and U.S. EPA DWSRF set-aside review reports that document work conducted under the WHP set-aside</i> ▪ <i>Quickr link to Ohio's criteria for substantial implementation—In addition to Ohio's criteria for substantial implementation, this link includes Ohio's 2013 list of CWSs substantially implementing SWP strategies.</i> ▪ <i>Quickr link to CWA Section 106 (ground water section) grant reports (2011, 2012, and 2013)</i> ▪ <i>Quickr link to Ohio EPA SWP program fact sheet in the draft national SWP report (January 2012)</i> ▪ <i>Click here for Ohio's drinking water source protection newsletter updates (2011, 2012, and 2013)</i> ▪ <i>Quickr link to Ohio's SWP update presentation at the Region 5 state SWP managers meeting (October 2012)</i> ▪ <i>Click here for Ohio's source water assessment and protection program website.</i> ▪ <i>Click here for Ohio's ground water quality characterization program website.</i>
-----------------------------	--

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

FINAL—MARCH 14, 2014

FY2013 Ohio EPA PWSS Program Measures and Indicators EOY Summary

October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013

Ohio EPA contact: Beth Messer, beth.messer@epa.state.oh.us, (614) 644-2752

Region 5 contacts: Wendy Drake, drake.wendy@epa.gov, (312) 886-6705; and Andrea Porter, porter.andrea@epa.gov, (312) 886-4427

NOTES: An asterisk () indicates that a target was not met.*

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
Office of Water National Program Measures								
1	% of pop. served by CWS that receive DW that meet health based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-2.1.1 (Updated quarterly by HQ—NPM Measures Tables filtered for active, non-RTC'd MCL violations)	Quickr: National Water Program (NWP) measures	FY11: 82% FY12: 95% FY13: 94% FY14: 94%	FY ¹ (e.g., for FY14, the measure is calculated as of October 2014 for the period 7/1/13 to 6/30/14)	FY11 EOY: 96.9% (NOTE: Ohio had two large systems (Cleveland and Dayton) with new violations); FY11 4 th quarter: 96.6% FY12 EOY: 97.8% FY13 EOY: 98.4%
2	% of CWS that meet health based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-SP1.N11 (Updated quarterly by HQ—NPM Measures Tables)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 91% FY12: 94% FY13: 93% FY14: 93%	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 94.5%; FY11 4 th quarter: 94.6% FY12 EOY: 96.1% FY13 EOY: 96.4%
3	% of “person months” in which CWS are meeting health-based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-SP2 (Updated quarterly by HQ—NPM Measures Tables)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 91% FY12: 96% FY13: 96% FY14: 96%	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 98.8%; FY 11 4 th quarter: 99.2% FY12 EOY: 99.1% FY13 EOY: 99.4%
4	% of CWS with minimized risk b/c of SWP	NPM/GPRA	PWSS GW SWP	SDW-SP4a (Updated annually in October by States)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 41% FY12: 43% FY13: 43% FY14: 43%	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 43.3% FY12 EOY: 45% FY13 EOY: 45%
5	% of population served by CWSs with minimized risk b/c of SWP	NPM/GPRA	PWSS GW SWP	SDW-SP4b (Updated annually in October by States)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 62% FY12: 65% FY13: 64% FY14: 65%	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 63.4% FY12 EOY: 73.8% FY13 EOY: 64%
6	% of CWS with san. survey	NPM/	PWSS	SDW-01a	Quickr:	FY11: 97%	CY (e.g., July 2014)	FY11 EOY: As of July 2011, 96.3%*

¹ However, due to the lag between when data are submitted and when the FY ends, the actual date range of the data used for these measures is one quarter off from the FY.

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
	w/in the past 3 yrs	GPRA	SS	(Updated annually in July by HQ – Status queries updated by Region 5 in April and October) NOTE: This national measure was modified in FY14 to include ground water systems in addition to the surface water systems previously tracked.	NWP measures	FY12: 95% FY13: 92% FY14: 75% (See NOTE in “name and update schedule” column.)	data includes sanitary surveys at CWSs completed between 1/1/1 and 12/31/13; R5 also looks at NCWSs completed between 1/1/09 and 12/31/13, but this is not part of the national measure)	(282 out of 293) of the sanitary surveys at surface water CWSs were completed between CY2008 and CY2010. FY12 EOY: As of July 2012, 98.9% (269 out of 272) of the sanitary surveys at surface water CWSs were completed between CY2009 and CY2011. FY13 EOY: As of July 2013, 98.9% (269 out of 272) of the sanitary surveys at surface water CWSs were completed between CY2010 and CY2012. (States have until March 2014 to report CY2013 sanitary survey data for this measure.)
7	Fund utilization rate [cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative funds available for projects] for the DWSRF	NPM/ GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-04 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ and tracked through DWNIMS database)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 70% fund utilization rate for both ARRA and base funds, as well as for base only funds FY12: 95% for ARRA and base FY13: same as FY12 FY14: 90%	The FY14 EOY data are cumulative as of 6/30/14.	FY11 EOY: Ohio's fund utilization rate through 6/30/11 for the DWSRF was 91% for ARRA- and base-funded projects and 90% for base-funded projects only. Ohio surpassed the target. FY12 EOY: Ohio's fund utilization rate through 6/30/12 for the DWSRF was 86% for ARRA- and 85% for base-funded projects.* FY13 EOY: 89.6%* NOTE: Region 5's State and Tribal Programs Branch (STPB) uses tools and resources other than national measures SDW-04, SDW-05, and SDW-11 to provide an accurate evaluation of the state's progress in implementing the DWSRF program. Region 5 believes that the most recent DWSRF Performance Evaluation Report (PER), prepared by STPB with

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								input from GWDWB, should be consulted for a more accurate status of the state's DWSRF program.
8	# of DWSRF projects that have initiated operations	NPM/ GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-05 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ and tracked through DWNIMS database)	Quickr: NWP measures	FY11: 270 ARRA- and base-funded projects and 230 base-funded only projects FY12: 300 for ARRA and base FY13: 330 with ARRA and 280 base FY14: 410	The FY14 EOY data are cumulative as of 6/30/14.	FY11 EOY: Through 6/30/11, 285 ARRA- and base-funded DWSRF projects had initiated operations, and 237 base-funded projects had initiated operations. Ohio surpassed the target. FY12 EOY: Through 6/30/12, 329 ARRA- and base-funded DWSRF projects had initiated operations. Ohio surpassed the target. FY13 EOY: 383
9	% of DWSRF projects awarded to small PWSs serving <500, 501-3,300, & 3,301-10,000 consumers	NPM/ GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-11 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ)	Quickr: NWP measures	This is an indicator—there are no state targets.	The FY14 EOY data are cumulative as of 6/30/14.	FY11 EOY: Through 6/30/11, 64% (cumulative) of total DWSRF assistance agreements were with PWSs serving less than 10,001 people. FY12 EOY: 66% (through 6/30/12) FY13 EOY: 63% (through 6/30/13)
12	# & % of small CWS and NTNCWS (<500, 501-3,300, & 3,301-10,000) w repeat health-based NO ₃ & NO ₂ , Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR, & TCR violations	NPM/ GPRA	PWSS	SDW-15 (Updated annually in October by HQ)	Quickr: NWP measures	This is an indicator; there are no state targets.	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 2% (39 out of 1,874) FY12 EOY: 1.5% (28 out of 1,838) FY13 EOY: 1.6% (29 out of 1,806)
14	# & % of schools and childcare centers that meet all health-based DW standards	NPM/ GPRA	PWSS	SDW-17 (Updated annually in October by HQ, but can be	Quickr: NWP measures	This is an indicator; there are no state	same as item #1 above	FY11 EOY: 91% (304 out of 333) FY12 EOY: 94.7% (301 out of 318) FY13 EOY: 93.8% (285 out of 304)

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
				generated from quarterly NPM measure)		targets.		
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance National Program Measure								
15	During FY2012, the primacy agency must address with a formal enf action or RTC the # of priority systems equal to the # of its PWSs that have a score of 11 or higher on the July 2011 ETT report	NPM/OECA	PWSS ECA	SDWA02 (Updated quarterly by HQ at http://www.epa-otis.gov/otis/sdwa_home.html)	ETT websites: ETT (OECA's OTIS drinking water data website) ETT (R5 PWSS programs Quickr website)	FY11: Ohio committed to addressing or resolving 152 systems. FY12: 122 FY13: 78 FY14: 42	The ETT is generated on a quarterly basis with the measure based on FY ² .	FY11 EOY: Ohio addressed 224 systems (101 from the 2011 list, and an additional 62 that became ≥11) FY12 EOY: Ohio's 2012 commitment was to address or resolve 122 systems. As of October 2012, Ohio addressed 215 systems. Ohio is commended for this accomplishment. FY13 EOY: Ohio's 2013 commitment was to address or resolve 78 systems. As of October 2013, Ohio addressed 144 systems. Ohio is commended for this accomplishment.
Regional Shared Goals								
16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of <u>NTNCWSs</u> meeting all health-based standards 2. % of <u>TNCWSs</u> meeting all health-based standards 3. % of <u>population</u> served by CWSs with <u>significant/major monitoring violations</u> (includes LCR Type 66 violations) 4. % of <u>CWSs</u> with <u>significant /major monitoring violations</u> (includes LCR 	Shared Goals		(Updated annually in April by Region 5; the milestones were revised in CY12)	Quickr: Regional shared goals	By CY2016: 1 = ≥95% 2 = ≥95% 3 = <5% 4 = <10% 5 = <5% 6 = <10% 7 = <10%	CY	For CY2012: 1 = 93.0%* 2 = 92.7%* 3 = 16.2%* (15.1% without Type 66) 4 = 16.0%* (10.6% without Type 66) 5 = 7.8%* 6 = 6.7% 7 = 19.6%*

² Each quarterly ETT calculation includes the most current data in the associated SDWIS/FED data freeze. For example, the October 2012 ETT includes data through 6/30/2012. The ETT retrieves addressed violations going back 5 years from the most current data (i.e., for October 2012, the ETT retrieves addressed violations from 7/1/2007 to 6/30/2012). Note that addressed violations do not contribute to ETT scores. In addition, the ETT score includes all un-addressed violations, even if they are more than 5 years old.

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
	Type 66 violations) 5. % of <u>NTNCWSs</u> with significant/major monitoring violations for <u>acute</u> health risks 6. % of <u>NTNCWSs</u> with significant/major monitoring violations for <u>chronic</u> health risks (LCR Type 66 violations are not included, not considered chronic) 7. % of <u>TNCWSs</u> with significant/major monitoring violations							
Regional Program Oversight Measures								
17	# & % Violations/Yr	Logic Model Reporting Tool (LMRT)		A6(1) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—the LRMT captures 5 calendar years of data (e.g., the July 2012 dataset includes data from January 2007 to December 2011) ³	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: A6(1) continues to show generally stable numbers of PN tier 1, 2, and 3 violations between 2008 and 2012. There continue to be relatively low numbers of tier 1 violations, ranging from 21 in 2009 to 51 in 2011.
18	Cumulative # & % <u>Chem/Rad/DBP Violations</u> Responded to/Yr	LMRT		O6(1) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: As of 2012, there were 80 non-health-based (M/R) chem/rad/DBP violations with violation years from 2008 to 2011 with no response reported, the majority of which occurred at small

³ The LMRT is violation-based and pulls violations for 5 years from SDWIS/FED and assigns each violation a year in which it occurred, based on the various dates reported to us generally as compliance period begin dates. For 2007-2011, all violations that occurred in one of those years would be included. Long-term, open-ended violations that occurred before 2007 would not be included, even if they were still open at that time. A violation that occurs during the 5-year period is included in the LMRT, regardless of its enforcement status.

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								and very small systems. However, six of these 80 violations have been RTC'd based on data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, and nine of these violations are for unregulated contaminants, which may be errors. Sixty-five of these 80 violations indicate no action taken by Ohio EPA as of July 26, 2013.
19	Cumulative # & % <u>TCR/SWTR/FBRR Violations</u> Responded to/Yr	LMRT		O6(1b) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: As of 2012, there were 7 TCR MCL and 1 TCR M/R violations with violation years from 2007 to 2008 with no response reported, all of which occurred at very small systems. These violations do not appear in the data provided by Ohio EPA on July 26, 2013, because these violations occurred before April 1, 2009.
20	Cumulative # & % <u>"Other" Violations</u> Responded to/Yr	LMRT		O6(1c) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: There continue to be a relatively small number of 2008 to 2012 "other" (CCR and PN) violations for which no response was reported as of 2012. Specifically, as of 2012, there were 10 CCR violations from 2008, 7 CCR violations from 2009, 1 PN violation from 2010, 4 PN violations from 2011, and 5 (4 PN and 1 CCR) violations from 2012 with no response reported. Very small systems comprised 81 percent (22 violations) of the CCR/PN violations from 2008 to 2012 with no response reported as of 2012.
21	<u>Violation Response Rate:</u> Estimated Median Time (in days) Between Proxy Vio	LMRT		O6(2) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: The majority of all violation types (87 percent or 9,336 violations) continued

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
	Awareness Date & Vio Response, over the most recent 5 yrs							to receive a first response reported within two months. The percentage of PN tier 1 violations addressed within 30 days has generally been increasing between 2008 and 2012, ranging from 75 percent in 2008 to 97 percent in 2009. Ohio reported a first response to 87 percent (135 violations) of the PN tier 1 violations within 30 days or less of the proxy violation awareness date and 65 percent (101) within a week between 2008 and 2012. The first response rates to tier 2 violations within 30 days continue to improve between 2008 and 2012. Ohio reported a first response to 93 percent (2,068) of the tier 2 violations within two months and 72 percent (1,594) within 1 month, the latter of which is an improvement compared to 66 percent according to the last (July 2012) dataset. Ohio reported a first response to 85 percent (7,125) of the tier 3 violations within 2 months and 57 percent (4,774) within 1 month.
22	<u>Violation RTC Rate</u> : Time (in days) between proxy vio awareness date and RTC date, over the most recent 5 yrs	LMRT		O6(2b) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: The majority of tier 1 violations that occurred between 2008 and 2012—84 percent (114 out of 136 violations)—were RTC'd within one year. Of these tier 1 violations, 30 percent (16 out of 54) of the LT1 TT violations and 9 percent (6 out of 66) of the TCR MCL violations took more than one year to RTC; all of the nitrate violations were RTC'd within one year. The majority of tier 2 violations—81 percent (1,418 out of 1,744) were RTC'd within one

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								year. The majority of tier 3 violations—85 percent (5,741 out of 6,772)—were RTC'd within one year.
23	# & % of Systems in Compliance with TT, MCL, and MRDL Requirements/Yr	LMRT		S5(1) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: Between 2008 and 2012, the number of systems in violation with MCL/TT/MRDL requirements ranged from 277 in 2009 to 326 in 2011. Eighty percent (1,207) of the systems with MCL/TT/MRDL violations were for TCR, 7 percent (111) were for Stage 1 DBP, 5 percent (74) were for arsenic, and 4 percent were for LCR.
24	# & % of Systems in Compliance with M/R Requirements/Yr	LMRT		S5(2) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: Between 2008 and 2012, the number of systems in violation of M/R requirements ranged from 749 in 2011 to 908 in 2010. In the 2008 to 2012 period, 66 percent (2,674) of the systems with M/R violations were for TCR, 11 percent (444) were for LCR, 10 percent (410) were for nitrate, and 3 percent were for Stage 1 DBP and GWR (121 and 111, respectively).
25	# & % of Systems in Compliance with 'Other' Requirements/Yr	LMRT		S5(4) (Updated annually in July by HQ)	Quickr: LMRT	None.	CY—see explanation above	July 2013: ACTIVE SYSTEMS ONLY: The number of systems with "other" (mostly CCR, as well as some PN rule, GWR, and LT2) violations has been steadily increasing between 2008 and 2012 in all size types. Between 2008 and 2012, the number of systems with other violations ranged from 29 in 2009 to 105 in 2012. Ninety-one percent (247) of systems with other violations between 2008 and 2012 CCR, 7 percent were for PN, and the rest were for GWR and LT2 (1 percent

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								each).
26	New Rule Violation Completeness Reporting (GWR, LCRSTR, Stage 2, LT2, and 141.130(c) operator certification treatment technique requirements)	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM	(Updated in April and October by Region 5)	Quickr: R5 high priority query—new rule completeness reporting	None.	N/A—this query pulls all violations for the new rules ever reported for any system type	January 2014 (<i>active</i> systems only): LT2: 24 TT violations total (mostly type 41, three of which are type 45) GWR: 4 TT (2 type 42, 1 type 45, and 1 type 48) violations, 316 M/R (type 34) violations, and 2 other (type 20) violations Stage 2: 158 M/R violations total (114 type 30, 42 type 35, and 2 type 27 violations); 0 MCL/MRDL violations LCRSTR: 429 M/R (type 66) violations Stage 1: 0 type 12 TT violations
27	GW Sanitary Survey Completeness	R5 High Priority	PWSS Sanitary Surveys GWR	(Updated in April and October by Region 5) NOTE: This is a national measure beginning in FY14.	Quickr: R5 high priority query—ground water sanitary survey completeness	None.	CY (e.g., July 2014 data will include CWS sanitary surveys completed between 1/1/11 and 12/31/13 and NCWS sanitary surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/14) ⁴	FY11: As of April 2011, 93% of the ground water CWSs, about 96% of ground water NTNCWSs, and about 96% of ground water TNCWSs have completed sanitary surveys. FY12: As of April 2012, 94.3% of the ground water CWSs (878 out of 931), 97.3% of the ground water NCWSs (2,632 out of 2,704), and 96.3% of the ground water NTNCWSs (631 out of 655) have completed sanitary surveys. FY13: As of April 2013, 97.6% of the ground water CWSs (919 out of 942) completed sanitary surveys between CY2010 and CY2012. In addition, 98.9% of the ground water NTNCWSs (642 out of 649) and 98.5% of the ground water TNCWSs (2,645 out of 2,684) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2008 and CY2012. FY14: As of October 2013, 89.4% of

⁴ This will be measured in July 2013 for CWSs surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/12, in July 2014 for NCWSs surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/14, and then every year after that (with rolling three-year periods).

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								the ground water CWSs (840 out of 940) completed sanitary surveys between CY2011 and CY2013. In addition, 92.6% of the ground water NTNCWSs (600 out of 648) and 93.5% of the ground water TNCWSs (2,513 out of 2,687) have completed sanitary surveys between CY2009 and CY2013.
28	Late TCR Rule Reporting	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM TCR	(Updated annually in October by Region 5)	Quickr: R5 high priority query—late TCR reporting	None.	CY	CY2011-2012: As of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 data indicate that 99.4% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2011 (2011 total: 1,080), and 99.8% of TCR violations were reported on time in 2012 (2012 total: 1,114). Ohio is commended for this achievement.
29	Late Nitrate Rule Reporting	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM NO ₂ /NO ₃	(Updated annually in October by Region 5)	Quickr: R5 high priority query—late nitrate rule reporting	None.	CY	CY2011-2012: As of October 2013, the CY2011 to CY2012 data indicate a decline in the timeliness of reporting—96.5% of nitrate violations were reported on time in 2011 and 3.5% were reported one quarter late (2011 total: 115). In 2012, 85.2% of nitrate violations were reported on time, and 14.8% were reported one quarter late (2012 total: 88).
30	Arsenic MCL Non-compliance (% CWS/NTNCWS systems in violation)	NEW R5 High Priority	PWSS As	(Updated quarterly by HQ—NPM Measures Tables filtered for active, non-RTC'd arsenic MCL violations)	Quickr: R5 high priority query—arsenic MCL non-compliance	None.	This query is based on data in the 4th quarter national program measure tables (e.g., the January 2014 query covers the period from 10/1/2012 to 9/30/2013).	FY11: As of January 2012, 0.5% of both CWSs (6 out of 1,261) and NTNCWSs (4 out of 762), respectively, had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd. FY12: As of January 2013, these numbers improved: 0.3% of CWSs (4 out of 1,237) had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd, and there were no NCWSs with arsenic violations not RTC'd. FY13: As of January 2014, 3 systems

FY2013 OHIO EPA PWSS PROGRAM MEASURES AND INDICATORS EOY SUMMARY

#	Description	Type	Used for	Name and update schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (e.g., CY/FY)	End-of-year (EOY) results and comments
								had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd, including 0.16% of CWSs (2 out of 1,224) and 0.15% of NTNCWSs (1 out of 214,671). There were no TNCWSs with arsenic violations not RTC'd.